

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/801,598	03/17/2004	03/17/2004 Sakari Kotola		1909
27123	7590 05/16/2006		EXAMINER	
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.			NGUYEN, SIMON	
	NANCIAL CENTER NY 10281-2101		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2618	

**DATE MAILED: 05/16/2006** 

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/801,598	KOTOLA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	SIMON D. NGUYEN	2618			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim  11 apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONED	I.  lety filed  the mailing date of this communication.  O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
<ol> <li>Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 Fe</u></li> <li>This action is FINAL.</li> <li>Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E.</li> </ol>	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4)  Claim(s) 1-7,9-41 and 45 is/are pending in the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) 1-7,9-41 and 45 is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10)☑ The drawing(s) filed on 17 March 2004 is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	a) accepted or b) objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🗆 Intendence Succession	(PTO 412)			
2) Notice of Practices Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4)				

Application/Control Number: 10/801,598

Art Unit: 2618

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1, 4-5, 20-21, 26-27, 38-41, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wynblatt et al. (6,219,696) in view of Lorello et al. (US 2004/0224706 A1), and further in view of Klassen et al. (2005/0239494).

Regarding claim 1, Wynblatt discloses a drive-by internet information distributing information to a mobile terminal (26), wherein the system having a local agent (28) for distributing information to the mobile terminal via a short range transmitter (abstract, fig.2), comprising: receiving a remote service link (URL) across a SWR by a service provider (42) (column 2 lines 40-48, 59-67, column 4 line 62 to column 5 line 8); deleting (dropping) stored links when a queue is full to make room for a new one (column 4 lines 35-37); storing the service link (column 2 line 42). However, Wynblatt does not specifically disclose the steps of replacing an earlier stored link with a newly received link when the identifier is the same and displaying the newly received link and validating the service link before deleting.

Lorello discloses the steps of replacing an older message previously stored by a newly received message when the messages are the same identifier (paragraphs 64, 72, 86, 86, abstract) and displaying the newly received message (paragraph 93, fig.5D).

Klassen discloses a method for storing service links (browser bookmarks) in a wireless device (abstract, paragraphs 32-34) comprises the step of validating the service links prior to deleting (paragraphs 43-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have Wynblatt, modified by Lorello and Klassen in order to provide an efficient use of memory capacity.

Regarding claims 20-21, and 45, these claims are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1.

Regarding claims 38-39, these claims are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1, wherein a stored program code, a processor for executing the stored program code are inherently in the system in order to make it works.

Regarding claims 40-41, these claims are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1, wherein the program product is inherently in the system for executing the service.

Regarding claims 4-5, 26-27, Wynblatt further discloses user activating the links (column 4 line 9-22) of a mobile (wireless) terminal (column 3 line 66), which inherently used in a cellular communication network.

3. Claims 2-3, 6-7, 9-19, 22-25, 28-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wynblatt et al. (6,219,696) in view of Lorello et al. (US 2004/0224706

Application/Control Number: 10/801,598

Art Unit: 2618

A1) and Klassen et al. (20050239494), and further in view of Ausems et al. (US 2003/0013483).

Regarding claims 2-3, 6-7, 10-12, 22-25, 28-30, in the modified Wynblatt system, Wynblatt discloses the links (URLs) stored in a URL queue. Lorello discloses storing in a folder, displaying folder menu, icons, service type (figs.6-7, 9). However, the modified Wynblatt system does not specifically disclose storing including telephone numbers.

Ausems discloses a PDA receiving a short range wireless signal related to the information of multiple linked pages (paragraphs 17, 31), wherein the information is stored in a folder menu, and being displayed in a form of the folder menu, icons and service type (paragraphs 18, 76-81), telephone numbers (paragraph 48). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Wynblatt, modified by Ausems in order to shorten a search time.

Regarding claims 13, 31, Wynblatt discloses the mobile terminal accessing link from an Internet with a website address (fig.2) which means the link is a wireless access protocol resource identifier.

Regarding claims 14-16, 32-34, in the modified Wynblatt system, Lorello discloses a SMS (paragraph 2). However, the modified Wynblatt system does not specifically disclose a HTML, and a bluetooth.

Ausems discloses the system implemented a HTML (paragraphs 53, 57), a SMS (paragraphs 61, 67), a bluetooth (paragraphs 42, 47, 64).

Art Unit: 2618

Regarding claims 17, 35, Wynblatt discloses the mobile terminal wireless receiving service links from a local agent (fig.2), which means the network inherently including a WLAN.

Regarding claims 9, 18-19, 36-37, in the modified Wynblatt system, Lorello discloses the link identifier. However, the modified Wynblatt system does not specifically disclose an identifier of the service provider, the short-range wireless network employs UWB and RFID.

It should be noted that in the art of providing message such as weather, stock, news information, which included an identifier of the service provider, is known to those skilled in the art. Besides, the short range transmission as a bluetooth of Ausems is obviously used an UWB and employed in a RFID which is also known to those skilled in the art in order to improve the transmission signal at a short distance.

## Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 9-41 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Regarding independent claims, the new cited art of Klassen disclosing the step of validating the service link prior to deleting or replacing (43-45). It should be noted that the newly cited art issued to Klassen discloses most of limitations in the claimed invention, such as, receiving a remote service links across a short range wireless communication from a provider, deleting a previously stored links when the storage is

Art Unit: 2618

full, storing a new service link, displaying the link, and deleting the link that is no longer valid (abstract, figs. 3-8, paragraphs 31-37, 41, 43-45).

### Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Simon Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-7894. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00 AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward F. Urban, can be reached on (571) 272-7899.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

600 Dulany, Alexandria, VA 22314

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Hand-delivered response should be brought to Knox building, 501 Dulany, Alexandria, VA.

Simon Nguyen

May 11, 2006

SIMON NGUYEN' PRIMARY EXAMINER